Case 3:16-cr-00344-JCS Document 12 Filed 12/09/16 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of	America,)	Case No. CR	16-344-005-1	
v.	Plaintiff,)		ORDER EXCLUDING TIME SPEEDY TRIAL ACT	
David All	of Hobbey)			
I	Defendant.)			
by the continuance outv	y the parties on the record 2, 2016 to weigh the best interest of burt makes this finding an	the public	and the defendar	b, the Court excludes time under the and finds that the ends of justice serve at in a speedy trial. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § a the following factor(s):	ed
	o grant a continuance wo J.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).		ly to result in a r	niscarriage of justice.	
defendar or law, t	nts, the nature of the hat it is unreasonable to e	ne prosecut expect adec	ion, or th uate preparation	ble reasons] the number of existence of novel questions of fact for pretrial proceedings or the trial 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	t
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
counsel'		mmitment		defendant continuity of counsel, give count the exercise of due diligence.	'n
necessar	o grant a continuance wo y for effective preparation J.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv	n, taking ir		defendant the reasonable time xercise of due diligence.	
IT IS SO ORD	ERED.				
DATED: 12/ STIPULATED:	Attorney for Defendant		JOSEPH C. SP Chief Magistra Assistant Unite	d States Attorney	
				DEC 09 2016	

DEC 09 7010

SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA